

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 7667			
	10/804,506	03/19/2004		Kenji Takahashi	5448-3				
	27799	7590	12/16/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER			
	COHEN, I	PONTANI	, LIEBERMAN &	NGUYEN, ANTHONY H					
	551 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1210				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	NEW YOR	-	1176		2854				

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		- 4	Application No.		Applicant(s)					
			10/804,506		TAKAHASHI ET AL.					
Office	e Action Summary	E	xaminer		Art Unit					
		A	Anthony H Nguyen		2854	·				
The MAII Period for Reply	LING DATE of this commun	ication appea	rs on the cover shee	t with the co	orrespondence ad	Idress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).										
Status										
1) Responsi	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.									
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.										
<i>,</i> —										
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Clai	ims									
4a) Of the  5)	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
Application Papers	S									
9)☐ The specif	ication is objected to by th	e Examiner.				•				
10)⊠ The drawii	ng(s) filed on 19 March 20	<u>04</u> is/are: a)[	☑ accepted or b)☐	objected to	by the Examiner	r. ·				
Applicant r	nay not request that any obje	ction to the dra	awing(s) be held in abo	eyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority under 35 L	J.S.C. § 119									
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>										
Attachment(s)										
1) Notice of Reference	ces Cited (PTO-892) rson's Patent Drawing Review (P	TO 040		ew Summary ( No(s)/Mail Da						
	sure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		5) 🔲 Notice		te atent Application (PTC	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/804,506

Art Unit: 2854

Claim Objections

Page 2

Claims 1-7 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims are

generally functional, narrative and awkward, and proper antecedent basis is not always

provided. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are

replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, claim 1, lines 2-4, claims 2,3 and 5

are narrative and functional. Additionally, there is no proper antecedent basis for "the other

webs" (claim 2 line 14). The language "them" (claim 2, line 14) is vague in that it is unclear

what element or device is referred to. Also, the word "downstreammost" appears to be a

typographical error. Correction is required.

The above are simply examples of the errors present. Applicant is required to carefully

review the claims and eliminate all such errors.

To the extent the claims are definite and positively recite structure, it appears that the

following prior art rejection is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

Art Unit: 2854

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over DeAngelis (US 5,547,225) in view of Loiacono (US 5,447,566).

With respect to claims 1,4,6 and 7, DeAngelis teaches a rotary press having printing units 20 and 22 which includes plate and blanket cylinders (Fig. 1 of DeAngelis shows a perfecting printing and col.4, lines 42 and 43 state that the printing unit is preferably the offset type), a dryer 24 disposed downstream of the printing unit 20, and a guide roller 40 disposed upstream of the dryer for guiding the printed web (c) from the printing unit into the dryer. The guide roller 40 appears to have a diameter which is equal to the diameter of the printing rollers or cylinders 20a-20e as shown in Fig.1 of DeAngelis. DeAngelis does not clearly teach the guide roller which is rotated synchronously at the identical peripheral speed with the printing cylinder. Loiacono teaches the conventional use of a controlling means for regulating the speed of the take-up means at the speed substantially equal to the speeds of plurality of rollers disposed in the timing module. In view of the teaching of Loiacono, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the press of DeAngelis by providing the controlling means as taught by Loiacono to permit more precise control the speed of the guide roller and the printing cylinder so that the guide roller can be synchronously rotated at the same peripheral speed of the printing cylinder in DeAngelis. With respect to claim 2, note that the webs are guided to the second printing unit 22 and printed parallel to the printing unit 20 (DeAngelis, Fig. 1). With respect to claims 3 and 5, the use of the printing cylinder and guide roller which are replaceable is extremely conventional.

## Conclusion

The patents to Puschnerat, Siler et al, Hillebrand et al. and Borel are cited to show other structures having obvious similarities to the claimed structure.

Application/Control Number: 10/804,506

Art Unit: 2854

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169. The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Anthony Nguyen

12/11/04

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2800

Suthony Nguyen

Page 4